



October 22, 2001

Mr. Charles M. Allen, II  
Legal Advisor  
Richardson Police Department  
P.O. Box 831078  
Richardson, Texas 75083-1078

OR2001-4791

Dear Mr. Allen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 153776.

The City of Richardson (the "city") received a request for the "Police Department Arrest Log(s) for the month of February 2001." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have also received arguments from the requestor in support of the release of the requested information. *See Gov't Code § 552.304.* We have considered all of the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Thus, information that a governmental body demonstrates relates to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation involving the governmental body may be withheld under section 552.103(a). *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

You contend that the requestor has threatened to sue three city police officers regarding his receipt of a citation in November 2000 for failing to identify himself to the officers. In support of this claim, you have submitted three claim notices sent to the officers by the requestor in which the requestor indicates he is seeking damages for an alleged illegal search and seizure. However, you have not demonstrated, nor does it appear, how the information responsive to the instant request for the February 2001 arrest logs relates to any anticipated litigation against the city or its police officers. Therefore, we find that you may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103.

We note, however, that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 261.201(a) of the Family Code provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Chapter 261 of the Family Code provides for the investigation of the abuse or neglect of a child. Portions of the submitted logs relate to allegations of child abuse and neglect. Therefore, this information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated that the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we have marked information that is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family

Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). The city must withhold the marked information from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by law. However, the city must release the remainder of the submitted information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Nathan E. Bowden".

Nathan E. Bowden  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 153776

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Fred Slice  
2406 Diamond Oaks  
Dallas, Texas 75044  
(w/o enclosures)